
Proposed Evaluation Standard

CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE FOR REGENERATIVE MEDICINE—RFA 07-03
FACILITIES WORKING GROUP CRITERIA, DEFINITIONS AND EVALUATION CRITERIA
D R A F T FOR DISCUSSION

Criteria	Definition	Evaluation Standards
Value Special Features Innovation/Sustainability Costs 25	<p>The investment represents a good return to the taxpayer while considering costs, quality, geographic location, and benefits of the project. The facility has innovative elements that encourage conservation and renewable resources. The project costs are reasonable and necessary.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs (up to 15 points) An evaluation of cost and program space provided from CIRM funds will establish the “net CIRM” cost and benefits. The project costs are reasonable and necessary based on CIRM’s review. Innovation/Sustainability (up to 5 points). These facilities elements have been documented and respond to CIRM objective in a cost-effective way. Full points will be allocated based on meeting the equivalent rating of “certified” under the US Green Building Standards. Special Features (up to 5 points) The facility offers some enhanced capability for development of regenerative medicine research.
Leverage 25	<p>The CIRM investment prompts additional investments that are consistent with the CIRM objectives; these investments are additional capital funding for the project. These costs include project cash expenditures prior to the Notice of Grant Award and may include (1) the purchase of land and/or a building at the documented cost to the institution and (2) other capitalized project cost. The project leverage attributable to internal project overhead and architectural and engineering costs will be no more than 10% of the total project costs.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Leverage ratio: The Additional Institutional cash funding for the project divided by the CIRM funding. (e.g. \$90/\$30=3x)
Urgency 20	<p>Places a high priority on completion of the project within two years; and the delivery of projects on an expedited schedule. The institution, the team and approach has a historic and proven track record of delivering capital projects on an expedited schedule. Start Date: Notice of Grant Award End Date: The base building is available for occupancy and/or installation of equipment.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 year completion (up to 10 points) Proven track record (up to 10 points) <p>The Applicants that show a plan of how the project will be completed within two years, and the plan is supported by a track record, receive higher score than those with longer completion.</p>
Shared Resources 15	<p>The project benefits from facility assets at the applicant site or collaborating institutions that reduce the cost to CIRM and increase the value for the mission.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capital Asset (up to 10 points) Operations and Collaborations (up to 5 points) <p>Applicants will document (1) how existing or proposed new facilities resources will be shared and (2) the savings and benefit attributable to the sharing arrangement.</p>

<p>Functionality 15</p>	<p>The planned space design for the base building and tenant improvements is consistent with the CIRM objectives of meeting current programmatic needs and expanding regenerative medicine research capacity and capabilities. The facility provides for long term flexibility while meeting scientific objectives.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The applicant has described the program to be housed in the new space. The facilities plan coincides with the program. The project provides the appropriate improvements to expand capacity and/or capability of regenerative medicine programs at this institution.

Source URL: <http://www.cirm.ca.gov/board-and-meetings/proposed-evaluation-standard>